

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTERREMARKS

SEP 29 2006

I. Introduction

In response to the Office Action dated August 15, 2006, claims 1, 10 and 19 have been amended. Claims 1-27 remain in the application. Re-examination and re-consideration of the application, as amended, is requested.

II. Telephone Interview Summary

Record is made of telephone interviews between Examiner Kim and Applicants' attorney that occurred on September 26, 2006 and September 27, 2006. The statutory subject matter rejections were discussed, as were the amendments proposed by Applicants' attorney to overcome these rejections.

III. Statutory Subject Matter Rejections and Allowable Claims

The Office Action rejects claims 1-8, 10-17 and 19-26 under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

However, claims 9, 18 and 27 are indicated as being allowable, if rewritten in independent form, including the base claim and any intervening claims.

With regard to the rejected claims, the Office Action asserts that these claims do not provide a useful result because they only recite "optimizing a query."

Applicants' attorney traverses these rejections, but nonetheless has amended claims 1, 10 and 19 to overcome this rejection. Applicants' attorney submits that "optimizing a query" is, in fact, a useful result. However, in the interests of expediting prosecution of this application, claims 1, 10 and 19 have been amended to overcome the rejection.

Should issues still remain in this regard, Applicants' attorney requests that the Examiner indicate how the rejection can be overcome, in accordance with the directives of the Examination Guidelines for Computer-Related Inventions. See Guidelines II M.P.E.P. § 2106. Specifically, should it be necessary, the Applicants' attorney requests that the Examiner identify features of the invention that would render the claimed subject matter statutory if recited in the claim. See Guidelines IV, M.P.E.P. § 2106.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the above, it is submitted that this application is now in good order for allowance and such allowance is respectfully solicited.

Should the Examiner believe minor matters still remain that can be resolved in a telephone interview, the Examiner is urged to call Applicants' undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

GATES & COOPER LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

Howard Hughes Center
6701 Center Drive West, Suite 1050
Los Angeles, California 90045
(310) 641-8797

Date: September 29, 2006

GHG/

By: 
Name: George H. Gates
Reg. No.: 33,500